# ATTACHMENT 89

### Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 230-39 Filed 05/17/24 Page 2 of 9 \*\*\* CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY \*\*\*

```
1
                      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
                FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 3
                         SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
 4
       SURGICAL INSTRUMENT SERVICE
 5
       COMPANY, INC.,
                                       ) Case No.:
                                       ) 3:21-cv-03496-VC
 6
                  Plaintiff,
                                        ) Lead Case No.:
 7
                                        ) 3:21-cv-03825-VC
             vs.
       INTUITIVE SURGICAL, INC.,
 8
                                       ) Pages 1 to 65
                  Defendant
 9
10
       IN RE: DA VINCI SURGICAL ROBOT )
       ANTITRUST LITIGATION
11
       THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:
12
       ALL ACTIONS
13
14
                *** CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY ***
15
                              DEPOSITION OF:
                          KEITH ROBERT JOHNSON
16
17
                        IN HIS PERSONAL CAPACITY
18
                       THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2022
19
                                1:27 p.m.
20
21
       REPORTED BY:
22
       Vickie Blair
23
       CSR No. 8940, RPR-CRR
24
       JOB NO. 5539883
25
       PAGES 1 - 68
                                                    Page 1
```

## Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 230-39 Filed 05/17/24 Page 3 of 9 \*\*\* CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY \*\*\*

1	your answers about that timeline be roughly the same?	14:52:00
2	MR. CHAPUT: Object to the form.	14:52:06
3	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm I'm I'm a	14:52:09
4	sales guy, I'm looking for opportunities to sell. This	14:52:11
5	robotic program created an opportunity for SIS to	14:52:15
6	substantially increase the revenue of our organization,	14:52:18
7	a great opportunity, and that was what I I was I	14:52:20
8	was pumped about the opportunity.	14:52:24
9	BY MR. SNYDER:	14:52:25
10	Q Let's let's go let's go there next.	14:52:29
11	I just have a few questions.	14:52:33
12	This morning I believe you used the word	14:52:35
13	"monumental" in connection with the level of interest	14:52:41
14	in EndoWrist repair.	14:52:43
15	Is that a word that you used in that	14:52:44
16	context, Mr. Johnson?	14:52:46
17	A I believe I did, and I don't use that word	14:52:48
18	very often.	14:52:50
19	Q And are are there are there key	14:52:53
20	key moments or key events that you have in mind when	14:53:01
21	you refer to the monumental level of interest in	14:53:05
22	EndoWrist repair?	14:53:08
23	MR. CHAPUT: Object to the form.	14:53:11
24	THE WITNESS: Yeah, there's there's a	14:53:12
25	couple very distinct meetings that stick out in my	14:53:16
		Page 50

## Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 230-39 Filed 05/17/24 Page 4 of 9 \*\*\* CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY \*\*\*

1	how large Vizient is? I mean, you said they're the	14:56:11
2	largest, but what does that mean?	14:56:15
3	A Yeah, they represent, don't quote me	14:56:16
4	specifically, but they represent somewhere between	14:56:19
5	2,500 and 3,000 hospitals.	14:56:22
6	Q And what what's Vizient's geographic	14:56:24
7	scope?	14:56:29
8	A National, every state in the union.	14:56:29
9	Q Another another name that I believe	14:56:36
10	came up earlier today was Johns Hopkins.	14:56:37
11	Did you mention Johns Hopkins?	14:56:41
12	A Yes.	14:56:43
13	Q What do you recall about did you meet	14:56:43
14	with Johns Hopkins at any point?	14:56:45
15	A Yes.	14:56:48
16	Q What do you recall about that meeting?	14:56:48
17	A I could describe the gentleman to you	14:56:56
18	because I remember specifically what he looked like, I	14:56:57
19	believe he was the director of sourcing or the VP of	14:57:00
20	supply chain, and forgive me for not remembering his	14:57:04
21	title specifically, that meeting was teed up by the	14:57:08
22	Vizient director that the client executor that	14:57:13
23	managed that relationship with Johns Hopkins, and they	14:57:17
24	told them that they had a vendor that had a cost	14:57:19
25	savings program around robotic surgery.	14:57:21
		Page 53

## Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 230-39 Filed 05/17/24 Page 5 of 9 \*\*\* CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY \*\*\*

1	Clinic.	14:58:33
2	Did I get that right?	14:58:37
3	A Yes, sir.	14:58:38
4	Q And did you ever talk with or meet with	14:58:39
5	the Mayo representatives of the Mayo Clinic?	14:58:41
6	A Yes.	14:58:44
7	Q And what was it an in-person meeting?	14:58:44
8	A They all took place over Zoom.	14:58:50
9	Q Okay. This is during the during the	14:58:52
10	pandemic?	14:58:54
11	A Yes, sir.	14:58:54
12	Q And what what do you recall about that	14:58:56
13	Zoom meeting with the Mayo Clinic?	14:58:58
14	A The meetings have all gone the same, and I	14:59:07
15	say that with all honestly, they they have a vested	14:59:09
16	interest in finding ways to reduce costs on their	14:59:14
17	robotic surgery. We explained to them the program,	14:59:17
18	they're excited about it.	14:59:21
19	And I didn't finish my statement before	14:59:22
20	about Johns Hopkins.	14:59:24
21	"Keith, this sounds great, let us do our	14:59:28
22	due diligence and we'll get back to you." Every single	14:59:31
23	one of those groups have come back, either via email or	14:59:35
24	a phone call saying, "Keith, Intuitive does not allow	14:59:39
25	us, they will not allow us to do your program, our	14:59:44
		Page 55

## Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 230-39 Filed 05/17/24 Page 6 of 9 \*\*\* CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY \*\*\*

1	follow-up questions, Mr. Johnson, based on Mr. Snyder's	15:02:24
2	questioning.	15:02:27
3		15:02:29
4	FURTHER EXAMINATION	15:02:29
5	BY MR. CHAPUT:	15:02:29
6	Q Okay. So, first, you were describing this	15:02:29
7	conversation you had with some folks at Johns Hopkins,	15:02:34
8	and I think you said that Vizient told them that SIS	15:02:37
9	had a cost savings program around robotic surgery; is	15:02:40
10	that right?	15:02:46
11	A Yes.	15:02:46
12	Q Which program was that referring to?	15:02:46
13	A The specific one with Johns Hopkins, I	15:02:56
14	believe.	15:02:56
15	And a lot of those calls started out with	15:03:00
16	us asking that vendor, "Do you mind sharing what your	15:03:03
17	mix of robots is? Do you have any SIS? Do you have	15:03:10
18	any Xi's?"	15:03:16
19	And then that would we would base our	15:03:17
20	conversation, excuse me, off of what robots they had,	15:03:18
21	and I think, if I remember specifically, Johns Hopkins	15:03:21
22	didn't have any Si robots at that time, so we were	15:03:24
23	talking them about the recovery and recycle program.	15:03:28
24	Q When did that conversation with Johns	15:03:35
25	Hopkins occur?	15:03:37
		Page 58

## Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 230-39 Filed 05/17/24 Page 7 of 9 \*\*\* CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY \*\*\*

1	correctly, 300 or so SIS still in the United States,	15:05:35
2	and I think from what we know now, there's less than a	15:05:41
3	hundred still being used in the states today, so	15:05:45
4	there's not a lot of opportunity for Si conversation.	15:05:47
5	So all of that time that we were not	15:05:50
6	allowed to talk about Si or couldn't talk about Si	15:05:54
7	because of the fear in the industry, it kinda took our	15:05:58
8	opportunity away to be successful with that program.	15:06:01
9	Q Did Johns Hopkins end up going forward	15:06:13
10	with the recovery program that SIS offers?	15:06:18
11	A We did not end up doing any robotic	15:06:22
12	business with Johns Hopkins.	15:06:25
13	Q Did you have any communications with Johns	15:06:27
14	Hopkins by email?	15:06:34
15	A I'm sure we did.	15:06:34
16	Q You also testified about a conversation	15:06:43
17	you had with the Mayo clinic; correct?	15:06:44
18	A Yes.	15:06:47
19	Q When did your conversation or	15:06:48
20	conversations with the Mayo Clinic happen?	15:06:53
21	A Probably right around that same time.	15:06:56
22	Q So that would be late 2021?	15:07:02
23	A Yeah, probably, if I remember correctly,	15:07:04
24	probably a couple weeks or a month after that Johns	15:07:05
25	Hopkins call.	15:07:09
		Page 60

## Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 230-39 Filed 05/17/24 Page 8 of 9 \*\*\* CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY \*\*\*

Q Okay. Is either Mayo Clinic or Johns 15:07:09  Hopkins a current SIS customer? 15:07:17  No. 15:07:18  Under Clinic, was that also specific to the EndoWrist 15:07:27	
A No. 15:07:18  Q The conversation you had with the Mayo 15:07:18  Clinic, was that also specific to the EndoWrist 15:07:27	
Q The conversation you had with the Mayo 15:07:18  Clinic, was that also specific to the EndoWrist 15:07:27	
5 Clinic, was that also specific to the EndoWrist 15:07:27	
6 recovery program? 15:07:30	
7 A Yes. 15:07:35	
8 Q What was the result of your conversation 15:07:35	
9 with the Mayo Clinic? 15:07:38	
10 A The same result as Johns Hopkins. 15:07:43	
11 Q They didn't move forward? 15:07:45	
12 A What what we were told was, based 15:07:48	
off what I really what happened in the industry 15:07:56	
was when the repair program got launched, people felt 15:07:59	
that that violated their contract with Intuitive, and 15:08:04	
once that precedent was set, the conversations have 15:08:08	
been different since then because there is some 15:08:12	
hesitancy from the hospitals about does this really, 15:08:16	
truly affect our our service agreement or our 15:08:22	
20 warranty with Intuitive or not. 15:08:25	
Q Did Johns Hopkins and the Mayo Clinic 15:08:27	
refer to the repair program in any way in these 15:08:33	
conversations they had with you? 15:08:39	
A Not that I remember because I don't 15:08:40	
believe they have any SIS left. I think Johns 15:08:50	
Page 61	

## Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 230-39 Filed 05/17/24 Page 9 of 9 \*\*\* CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY \*\*\*

1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
2	, ==-
3	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES )
4	I, Vickie Blair, CSR No. 8940, RPR-CRR, in
5	and for the State of California, do hereby certify:
6	That, prior to being examined, the witness
7	named in the foregoing deposition was by me duly sworn
8	to testify as to the truth, the whole truth, and
9	nothing but the truth;
10	That said deposition was taken before me
11	at the time and place therein set forth, and was taken
12	down by me stenographically and thereafter transcribed
13	via computer-aided transcription under my direction and
14	is a true record of the testimony given;
15	I further certify I am neither counsel
16	for, nor related to, any party to said action, nor
17	interested in the outcome thereof;
18	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereto
19	subscribed my name this 5th day of November, 2022.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	Victie Calain
25	Vickie Blair, CSR No. 8940, RPR-CRR
	Page 65
	rage 65